

CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS  
Amanda Seabock, Esq., SBN 289900  
Chris Carson, Esq., SBN 280048  
Dennis Price, Esq., SBN 279082  
Mail: 8033 Linda Vista Road, Suite 200  
San Diego, CA 92111  
(858) 375-7385; (888) 422-5191 fax  
phylg@potterhandy.com

Attorneys for Plaintiff

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

**Scott Johnson,**

Plaintiff,

V.

**Zavala's Mini Storage, LLC**, a California Limited Liability Company; and Does 1-10,

## Defendants.

Case No.

# **Complaint For Damages And Injunctive Relief For Violations Of: American's With Disabilities Act; Unruh Civil Rights Act**

Plaintiff Scott Johnson complains of Zavala's Mini Storage, LLC, a California Limited Liability Company; and Does 1-10 (“Defendants”), and alleges as follows:

## PARTIES:

1. Plaintiff is a California resident with physical disabilities. Plaintiff is a level C-5 quadriplegic. He cannot walk and also has significant manual dexterity impairments. He uses a wheelchair for mobility and has a specially equipped van.

2. Defendant Zavala's Mini Storage, LLC owned the real property located at or about 2285 Tully Rd., San Jose, California, in April 2019.

3. Defendant Zavala's Mini Storage, LLC owned the real property located

1 at or about 2285 Tully Rd., San Jose, California, in May 2019.

2 4. Defendant Zavala's Mini Storage, LLC owns the real property located at  
3 or about 2285 Tully Rd., San Jose, California, currently.

4 5. Defendant Zavala's Mini Storage, LLC owned Zavala's Mini Storage  
5 located at or about 2285 Tully Rd., San Jose, California, in April 2019.

6 6. Defendant Zavala's Mini Storage, LLC owned Zavala's Mini Storage  
7 located at or about 2285 Tully Rd., San Jose, California, in May 2019.

8 7. Defendant Zavala's Mini Storage, LLC owns Zavala's Mini Storage  
9 located at or about 2285 Tully Rd., San Jose, California, currently.

10 8. Plaintiff does not know the true names of Defendants, their business  
11 capacities, their ownership connection to the property and business, or their  
12 relative responsibilities in causing the access violations herein complained of,  
13 and alleges a joint venture and common enterprise by all such Defendants.  
14 Plaintiff is informed and believes that each of the Defendants herein,  
15 including Does 1 through 10, inclusive, is responsible in some capacity for the  
16 events herein alleged, or is a necessary party for obtaining appropriate relief.  
17 Plaintiff will seek leave to amend when the true names, capacities,  
18 connections, and responsibilities of the Defendants and Does 1 through 10,  
19 inclusive, are ascertained.

20

21 **JURISDICTION & VENUE:**

22 9. The Court has subject matter jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28  
23 U.S.C. § 1331 and § 1343(a)(3) & (a)(4) for violations of the Americans with  
24 Disabilities Act of 1990, 42 U.S.C. § 12101, et seq.

25 10. Pursuant to supplemental jurisdiction, an attendant and related cause  
26 of action, arising from the same nucleus of operative facts and arising out of  
27 the same transactions, is also brought under California's Unruh Civil Rights  
28 Act, which act expressly incorporates the Americans with Disabilities Act.

1       11. Venue is proper in this court pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1331(b) and is  
2 founded on the fact that the real property which is the subject of this action is  
3 located in this district and that Plaintiff's cause of action arose in this district.

4

5       **FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS:**

6       12. Plaintiff went to Zavala's Mini Storage in April 2019 (twice) and May  
7 2019 with the intention to avail himself of its services, motivated in part to  
8 determine if the defendants comply with the disability access laws.

9       13. Zavala's Mini Storage is a facility open to the public, a place of public  
10 accommodation, and a business establishment.

11       14. Unfortunately, on the dates of the plaintiff's visits, the defendants failed  
12 to provide accessible parking.

13       15. On information and belief the defendants currently fail to provide  
14 accessible parking.

15       16. Additionally, on the dates of the plaintiff's visits, the defendants failed  
16 to provide accessible paths of travel leading into the portable restroom.

17       17. On information and belief the defendants currently fail to provide  
18 accessible paths of travel leading into the portable restroom.

19       18. Plaintiff personally encountered these barriers.

20       19. By failing to provide accessible facilities, the defendants denied the  
21 plaintiff full and equal access.

22       20. The lack of accessible facilities created difficulty and discomfort for the  
23 Plaintiff.

24       21. Even though the plaintiff did not confront the barrier, on information  
25 and belief the defendants currently fail to provide accessible paths of travel  
26 leading to the office of Zavala's Mini Storage.

27       22. The defendants have failed to maintain in working and useable  
28 conditions those features required to provide ready access to persons with

1 disabilities.

2       23. The barriers identified above are easily removed without much  
 3 difficulty or expense. They are the types of barriers identified by the  
 4 Department of Justice as presumably readily achievable to remove and, in fact,  
 5 these barriers are readily achievable to remove. Moreover, there are numerous  
 6 alternative accommodations that could be made to provide a greater level of  
 7 access if complete removal were not achievable.

8       24. Plaintiff will return to Zavala's Mini Storage to avail himself of its  
 9 services and to determine compliance with the disability access laws once it is  
 10 represented to him that Zavala's Mini Storage and its facilities are accessible.  
 11 Plaintiff is currently deterred from doing so because of his knowledge of the  
 12 existing barriers and his uncertainty about the existence of yet other barriers  
 13 on the site. If the barriers are not removed, the plaintiff will face unlawful and  
 14 discriminatory barriers again.

15       25. Given the obvious and blatant nature of the barriers and violations  
 16 alleged herein, the plaintiff alleges, on information and belief, that there are  
 17 other violations and barriers on the site that relate to his disability. Plaintiff will  
 18 amend the complaint, to provide proper notice regarding the scope of this  
 19 lawsuit, once he conducts a site inspection. However, please be on notice that  
 20 the plaintiff seeks to have all barriers related to his disability remedied. See  
 21 *Doran v. 7-11*, 524 F.3d 1034 (9th Cir. 2008) (holding that once a plaintiff  
 22 encounters one barrier at a site, he can sue to have all barriers that relate to his  
 23 disability removed regardless of whether he personally encountered them).

24

25 **I. FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE AMERICANS  
 26 WITH DISABILITIES ACT OF 1990** (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all  
 27 Defendants.) (42 U.S.C. section 12101, et seq.)

28       26. Plaintiff re-pleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth

1 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
2 complaint.

3 27. Under the ADA, it is an act of discrimination to fail to ensure that the  
4 privileges, advantages, accommodations, facilities, goods and services of any  
5 place of public accommodation is offered on a full and equal basis by anyone  
6 who owns, leases, or operates a place of public accommodation. See 42 U.S.C.  
7 § 12182(a). Discrimination is defined, *inter alia*, as follows:

8 a. A failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices,  
9 or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford  
10 goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or  
11 accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the  
12 accommodation would work a fundamental alteration of those  
13 services and facilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii).

14 b. A failure to remove architectural barriers where such removal is  
15 readily achievable. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv). Barriers are  
16 defined by reference to the ADA Standards.

17 c. A failure to make alterations in such a manner that, to the  
18 maximum extent feasible, the altered portions of the facility are  
19 readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities,  
20 including individuals who use wheelchairs or to ensure that, to the  
21 maximum extent feasible, the path of travel to the altered area and  
22 the bathrooms, telephones, and drinking fountains serving the  
23 altered area, are readily accessible to and usable by individuals  
24 with disabilities. 42 U.S.C. § 12183(a)(2).

25 28. When a business provides parking for its customers, it must provide  
26 accessible parking.

27 29. Here, accessible parking has not been provided.

28 30. When a business provides paths of travel, it must provide accessible

1 paths of travel.

2 31. Here, accessible paths of travel have not been provided.

3 32. The Safe Harbor provisions of the 2010 Standards are not applicable  
4 here because the conditions challenged in this lawsuit do not comply with the  
5 1991 Standards.

6 33. A public accommodation must maintain in operable working condition  
7 those features of its facilities and equipment that are required to be readily  
8 accessible to and usable by persons with disabilities. 28 C.F.R. § 36.211(a).

9 34. Here, the failure to ensure that the accessible facilities were available  
10 and ready to be used by the plaintiff is a violation of the law.

11

**12 II. SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION: VIOLATION OF THE UNRUH CIVIL  
13 RIGHTS ACT (On behalf of Plaintiff and against all Defendants.) (Cal. Civ.  
14 Code § 51-53.)**

15 35. Plaintiff repleads and incorporates by reference, as if fully set forth  
16 again herein, the allegations contained in all prior paragraphs of this  
17 complaint. The Unruh Civil Rights Act (“Unruh Act”) guarantees, *inter alia*,  
18 that persons with disabilities are entitled to full and equal accommodations,  
19 advantages, facilities, privileges, or services in all business establishment of  
20 every kind whatsoever within the jurisdiction of the State of California. Cal.  
21 Civ. Code § 51(b).

22 36. The Unruh Act provides that a violation of the ADA is a violation of the  
23 Unruh Act. Cal. Civ. Code, § 51(f).

24 37. Defendants’ acts and omissions, as herein alleged, have violated the  
25 Unruh Act by, *inter alia*, denying, or aiding, or inciting the denial of, Plaintiff’s  
26 rights to full and equal use of the accommodations, advantages, facilities,  
27 privileges, or services offered.

28 38. Because the violation of the Unruh Civil Rights Act resulted in difficulty,

1 discomfort or embarrassment for the plaintiff, the defendants are also each  
2 responsible for statutory damages, i.e., a civil penalty. (Civ. Code § 55.56(a)-  
3 (c).)

4       39. Although the plaintiff was markedly frustrated by facing discriminatory  
5 barriers, even manifesting itself with minor and fleeting physical symptoms,  
6 the plaintiff does not value this very modest physical personal injury greater  
7 than the amount of the statutory damages.

8

9       **PRAYER:**

10      Wherefore, Plaintiff prays that this Court award damages and provide  
11 relief as follows:

12      1. For injunctive relief, compelling Defendants to comply with the  
13 Americans with Disabilities Act and the Unruh Civil Rights Act. Note: the  
14 plaintiff is not invoking section 55 of the California Civil Code and is not  
15 seeking injunctive relief under the Disabled Persons Act at all.

16      2. Damages under the Unruh Civil Rights Act, which provides for actual  
17 damages and a statutory minimum of \$4,000 for each offense.

18      3. Reasonable attorney fees, litigation expenses and costs of suit, pursuant  
19 to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and Cal. Civ. Code §§ 52.

20

21      Dated: September 21, 2019      CENTER FOR DISABILITY ACCESS

22

23      By: 

24

25      Amanda Seabock, Esq.  
26      Attorney for plaintiff

27

28